

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 29-60 are cancelled, and claims 61-72 are added. Claims 1-28 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-28 and 61-72 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-18, and 21-28 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hori (the article titled, "Annotation of Web Content for Transcoding") in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 7,072,396). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Amended claim 1, for example, calls for:

generating means for generating additional information that controls said converting means's performing of the predetermined conversion process such that a mismatch between the converted video stream and the at least another stream is avoided when the converted video stream and the at least another stream are displayed on the common display device, the additional information being based on the multimedia coding data[.] (Emphasis added.)

The cited sections of Hori are only concerned with adapting an HTML document from one client device for display on another client device by generating annotations which only provide hints for adapting the document to other client devices. (See Introduction, second paragraph.) The cited sections of Hori do not disclose or suggest generating additional information that controls a converting means's performing of a predetermined conversion process such a mismatch between a converted video stream and at least another stream is avoided

when the converted video stream and the at least another stream are displayed on a common display device.

The cited sections of Wang are concerned only with encoding a video signal and are not at all concerned with avoiding a mismatch between a video stream and at least another stream. Hence, the cited sections of Wang do not disclose or suggest generating additional information that controls a converting means's performing of a predetermined conversion process such that a mismatch between a video stream and at least another stream is avoided.

It follows that neither the cited sections of Hori nor those of Wang, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the image coding apparatus defined in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 10, 19 and 20 include limitations similar to those described above regarding claim 1. Therefore, each of claims 10, 19 and 20 are distinguishable over the cited sections of the cited references for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10, and claims 21-28 depend from claim 20. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New claim 61 depends from claim 1, new claim 62 depends from claim 10, new claims 63-71 depend from claim 19, and new claim 71 depends from claim 20. Therefore, each of new claims 61-72 is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as its parent claim. New claims 63-67 and

69-71 have limitations similar to those set out, e.g., in claims 11-18 and are similarly supported. Support for new claims 61, 62, 68, and 72 is found, e.g., in ¶¶ [0148]-[0149] of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant